

8-21-02

K's project
was not only a
F.M.A

It was a risk
FA, with possibility
of catastrophe
(a political calamity)
— a gamble —
because it was
a DPP, a K/T
gamble with catastrophe
— to avoid an otherwise
sure, 5-6 loss (costs)

like esc. in SVN,
each time

(level done as a
(consult, description)

FA - exp. LBJ

July '65; TG;

RT

(like JFK in C-II;

FA, no consult.

with Congress, no prior
attempts at coercion

(Hearings) - RISKY

More risky than
immediate air strikes
before ^{any} operations

to strike op. missile
(that are not other
centers to attacks)
is very risky,
certainly causes
major damage —
(vs. 0 damage)

but the ^{damage} and the ^{higher}
extent of attack

Castro:
annihilation
(gloriously)
is no worse than
US occupation

Bates dead the
blue (white)
= ~~Hayden~~ Garbels

in C-II

Every party
showed showiness,
special life,
reasonable code.

along with weakly,
limited ideas,
stupid premises,
critical ignorance
of world & our
arguments - unknown
unknowns? - one of
Rumsfeld's non-stupid
notions.

There are "knows"
that are wrong
(a misunderstanding
or inherent
or uncertain)

X away

known
unknowns

Mark Twain: "It's what
you know that is
mistaken..."

The
Machines

The Harbor

Neither JFK nor K
were noble
men —

but they took
big risks (beyond
than they knew)
because they were
(secretly) desperate

(without knowing the
other one was, or
why)

by gambling
they lost "little more
to lose" compared to what
they were about to lose
if they didn't gamble

(The other sure
5-6 Personal loss
glanced lightly
(hypothetically -
obscure - how can
I avoid it?)

compared to the
chance (even, big-
things involved
widely) of a
loss that would in
other crises look (as it
is) catastrophic.

convinced with
a (the only)
chance of coming
out even or
ahead, averting
the loss is s-t!

C-IT as K/T
and DPP ✓

as well as F.M.A.

and gambles
(losing disproportionate,
irresponsible, reckless
- to observe

exp. to one not
aware of the
previous attitudes
s-t sure loss,
or what it means
to decide.

Challenger

Every RMA

Shybolt

Quemery

BBP / French
decide

SVN etc - events
s-t loss - postwar

Loss of prestige
honor
image
influence
role
allies
leadership
credibility

R actual as if
Cred. (of conduct)
is private channel
even if no reputation
(STOP) - zero-sum,
non-shared interests

as if he never
received Trust
of JFK

(Probus lies to
McMillan)

(Who did Edwards
lie to?)

Abens/Rhoads
(Who lies)

(A to Harry = No)

Wyp:

K wanted to
decide $V = K -$
but not to lie?

(Morganas did
not lie - nor Guley
but let child lie
through Buland had

(+Dab? or not?
did let lie to
Dab? / +Goran?

6-1-12 midnight

Binkowski

Chickens - HK

(WWI fighter duels?

WWF? (Bauer)

Berlin: turtles } of JFK
com

But what of B/Berlin?

"miniscule: water

(super-cooled "

phase change

unstable

detonation: explosion

(m + C3)

(WWI "crises" (ref?)

WWII? premed
(like WWI!)

of a series of
crises that did
not lead to war

[the day that did not
break (WWI was it?)

(me + VW; Scott Hayden's
google

(Rebuttal: "noir"?)

May 27

Handing

incorporation plans

Muzoon is

answering?

prevention

Shirin - collect. on

C.D.; give all of
files

(Is there a history
of Muzoon?)

Marshall asst. for
both of us? (Confusion)

Muchness craziness
(of thoughts)

a premise you
hope not to carry
out, hope you
won't be called
on to carry —
that you'd have to
be crazy to carry out —

so much more you
have to weirdly appear
crazy (with suff.
prob.) — Rank 5 14

Wf was the man
credible (as N
saw it)? (see Post!)

Despite his experience
& character, she could
be wrong to say
out there...

(real difference was
the balance (penit))

not the $\frac{1}{2}$ of 50
personality. $\frac{1}{2}$ S + 2d st
Cap -

From 1965-89
RCU limits the machines,

RPK
If Cubans were to
control MRBMs

more reason to
agitate/attack
though much more
dangerous, if attempted

* ~~attack~~ blockade
legal SU ship -
passage....!

(But SU subject to
esc used draining) was
hindered by US ability to

to ~~draw~~ SV
about us. US

Enability to draw
SV of cap. us.
Europe was
not (quite)
enough to make us
give up Berlin...

(otherwise - of not
negotiate East Germany?
if not we can?
Berlin?)

SCAN BOOKS

JS?

RINDLE?

Searchable
format?

RFK/Kaplan

- difference between

private + public deal

group

RFK Ann on
record for
that

Ever since

RFK/Holmes

only VFK (+R)

1 doc out 25

NEARLY

improvement on both sides
on editorial comments

Oct 27 - "play" - ignore
2d letter (Who?)

(BUT as Kap. says, accompanying
to group (inc. B or not?)
CBI DOVB COMMENTS

Centrad IRBMs

AVW against
(late 1958!

(not for same
reason as visits
to Cuba!

not dangerous for us
in 58 - because Bolivar
was not deliberate for
us. etc.

4-26-12

Ad & analysis:

- fine ground of
blowers

runer (?)

snake, seat, ash

(cyane

subject

- 1944+ derive for big
air power - to have
big R+D effort -

- A-bomb would
thrust the
(spont)

- but - to destroy
SC - with A-bombs
- and stop SC crisis
(conclude!)

"need" large force

- ongoing, get large force -
the, 2 years with H-bombs
[cos. from 15M to 300M]

("small" H. bombs -
switchable for ICBMs
(and MIRVs

(and - even EU
arms
(+ East Europe!)
area weapons

(still ignoring first-
striking, to mutually
"assured" weapons,
planes (not, "bombers")
on dual-platform

Of Mrs Thoms
since 44 —

— Which have been
justified in
retrospect?

— accuracy

— effectiveness

— proportionate

— NO BETTER

ALTERNATIVES?

— carrying off

of its end of threat
holding & keeping

(e.g. effort and
possibility of
ending war,
overriding D.M.,
abolishing arms
sanctions treaty)

Were any US threats
justified?
Europe? Berlin?

(Israel? Pak? ^NKorea?)